

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/601,723	CANFIELD ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	George Manuel	3762

All Participants:

(1) George Manuel

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(2) Malcolm J. Romano

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 April 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

25

Prior art documents discussed:

Schulman (US 4,071,032) and Schulman et al (US 5,358,514) and Klosterman et al (US 7,177,698)


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was agreed the prior art does not show the feature of a cylindrical tube formed as a unitary structure solely of ferrite in a microstimulator; and the limitation of the sleeve length being substantially coextensive with the length of the ferrite tube is not necessary to distinguish Applicant's claimed invention over the prior art..